

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

REMARKS

Claims 1-70 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 19, 38, 45, 53 and 59 are currently amended. Claims 65-70 are new. It is respectfully submitted that support for the amendments and newly added claims is found in the specification, drawings, abstract and claims, as original filed, and that no new matter has been added. In particular, support for newly added claims 66, 68 and 70 is found at least at page 19, line 16-page 20, line 3, page 16, line 20-page 17, line 2, and page 17, line 16-page 18, line 2; and support for newly added claims 65, 67 and 69 is found at least at page 13, line 13-15, page 15, lines 2-8, page 15, line 18-page 16, line 19, page 17, lines 9-13, page 17, line 16-page 18, line 11 and page 19, lines 16-25.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-28 and 30-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,078,322 to Siminoff et al. Each of claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-28 and 30-64, as now amended, is allowable for the reasons that follow.

Claim 1, as now amended, recites a method including ***generating***, with a client device, a particular form of a client-resident ***intermediate user interface (UI)*** for a server-based and client-side controlled application according to a UI format determined by a UI server, including ***supplementing a skeletal UI*** stored in a first memory location ***with one or more icons, labels or menu items***, or combinations thereof, stored in a second memory location. As understood, Siminoff et al. do not disclose this feature. Instead, Siminoff et al. disclose a Universal Client device that is embedded as an Applet tag in a web page that is downloaded from a server host to a client device. The Universal Client of Siminoff et al. is apparently entirely embedded within the web page and entirely downloaded to a single memory location at the client device, where it then

initializes and runs. Therefore, Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-11 and 13-17 are allowable as being dependent from amended Claim 1.

Claims 38 and 53, as now amended, are each allowable for the same reasons as amended Claim 1. Claims 39-44 are allowable as being dependent from amended claim 38. Claims 54-58 are allowable as being dependent from amended claim 53.

Claim 19, as now amended, recites a method that includes populating a UI form with a number of source data items. The number of source data items comprises a smaller subset than a total number of source data items related to a server-based application. Further subsets of the total number of source data items are downloadable based upon execution of one or more client-side controls. Advantageously, failures that conventionally occur during downloads of long files are prevented. Formatting errors from client device conversions are also prevented. This is because a smaller amount of data is downloaded, stored and displayed at a time.

In one example, a subset of a total list of emails may be initially downloaded in accordance with an embodiment of Applicants' invention as set forth at amended Claim 19. When the user scrolls to the bottom list, another subset of the total list of emails is downloaded for scrolling, etc. The email list is a set of data items viewable within the UI that represent objects that they correspond to, e.g., that may be retrieved upon execution of them by clicking or hitting the return button.

As understood, Siminoff et al. do not disclose this feature. The Examiner has cited column 12, lines 1-13 and 23-39 in rejecting Applicant's claim 31. The Examiner has also cited col. 16, lines 40-49, col. 14, lines 44-56, col. 9, lines 33-50 and col. 10, lines 23-30 in rejecting claim 14. However, none of these descriptions of Siminoff et al. relates to the downloading of subsets of **data items**, e.g., a list of emails of an exemplary embodiment illustrated at Figures 3 and 4 and page 15, line 13-page 17, line 2 of Applicant's specification. As understood, the teaching by Siminoff et al. at column 12, lines 23-39 is a generalized description of a client system that has an entire UI list of items, but not the objects associated with the items themselves. Upon execution, e.g., by clicking, of an item, the object is retrieved from the server using scripted communications. This is entirely different from Applicant's invention.

There is no teaching of Siminoff et al. wherein a subset of an entire list of emails, or more generally a subset of a total number of data items, would be originally downloaded, and then further subsets are downloaded as UI events dictate. Instead, the entire list or number of data items would be downloaded all at once in accordance with the teachings of Siminoff et al. The teachings of the recited sections of Siminoff et al., also including the flow chart of Figure 4 and 5, describe a technique wherein an email is clicked, or one of the data items in a list is clicked, or otherwise executed such as by highlighting and depressing the return button. In that event (see step 5 of Figure 5 of Siminoff et al.), the data item or object associated with it is retrieved using scripted communications between the client device and a host server. For example, the body text of the listed email that was clicked may be retrieved from the server host. There is no teaching by Siminoff et al. that subsets of a total number of data items represented in a UI are downloaded at different times, or even that the data required to instantiate an object associated with a data item are downloaded other than all at once.

In view of the above, Claim 19 is allowable. Claims 20-37 are allowable as being dependent from amended Claim 19. Claims 45 and 59, as now amended, are each allowable for the same reasons as amended Claim 19. Claims 46-52 are allowable as being dependent from amended claim 45. Claims 60-64 are allowable as being dependent from amended claim 59.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 12 and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siminoff et al. in view of U.S. patent no. 6,327,608 to Dillingham. Neither Siminoff et al. nor Dillingham, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests all of the elements of either of claims 12 or 29. Claims 12 and 29 are allowable as being dependent from amended Claims 1 and 19, respectively, for the reasons set forth above.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siminoff et al. in view of Official Notice. Neither Siminoff et al. nor the Examiner's Official Notice, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests all of the elements of claim 18. Claim

18 is allowable as being dependent from amended Claim 1 for the reasons set forth above.

NEWLY ADDED CLAIMS

Newly added claims 66, 68 and 70 are allowable as being respectively based on Claims 19, 45 and 59, and also for the same reasons as amended claim 1.

Newly added claims 65, 67 and 69 are allowable as being respectively based on Claims 1, 38 and 53, and also for the same reasons as amended claim 19.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner's reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

A check in the amount of \$54 is enclosed for payment of the new claims. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896. A duplicate page is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH, LLP

Dated: 8-9-04

By *AVS*
Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant

GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
153 Townsend Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: 415-836-2522
Facsimile: 415-836-2501

Customer No.: 29585